



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/695,917	10/26/2000	Mamoru Miyashita	905-0248P	2868

2292 7590 01/14/2003

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH  
PO BOX 747  
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CHANH DUY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2675

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2003

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/695,917

Applicant(s)

MIYASHITA, MAMORU

Examiner

Chanh Nguyen

Art Unit

2675

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 October 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. The amendment filed on October 30, 2002 has been entered and considered by examiner.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 4, 5-7 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueda et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,748,237) in view of Hibino et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,751,343) and Hattori et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,739,859)

As to claim 1, Ueda discloses a liquid crystal display device having a case (1) internally accommodating a liquid crystal display panel (2) which display an image represented by an applied image signal, , the case (1) being performed to include a freely openable and closable light admission window (6) for admitting outside light (see column 2, lines 65-67), and a light guide path (9) being formed for introducing the outside light, which has been admitted by opening the light admission window (6) to the back side of the liquid crystal display panel (2); see figure 1.

Ueda teaches a liquid crystal display device including a backlight device (5) for projecting backlight toward the back side of the liquid crystal display panel (2), a setting unit (8) for setting to admit outside light from the light admission window or to

Art Unit: 2675

project backlight from the backlighting device (5) (see column 3, lines 25-32), a signal correction circuit and a backlight control circuit (24-27) for subjecting the applied image signal to a correction for outdoor display in response to a setting by the setting unit (8) for admission of the outside light and from turning on the backlight device in response to a setting by setting unit for projection of the backlight, respectively (see column 4, line 25 through column 5, line 21).

The only different from the reference of Ueda and the claim 1 only in that Ueda only mention adjusting white balance for correcting a color video signal (column 4, line 32-37) whereas claim 1 recites "correction selected from the group consisting of a gamma correction, luminance correction, contour correction, hue correction, and color saturation correction". In same field of endeavor, Hibino teaches that "a processing circuit 203 has image correcting functions, such as white balance, luminance correction, contour correction, and color correction,..." (see column 4, lines 10-15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to have substituted the luminance correction circuit or contour correction circuit as taught by Hibino to the color correction of Ueda so that the brightness or contour portion of the image can be corrected (see column 4, line 64 through column 5, line 5), thereby the image can be viewed with proper colors.

Ueda teaches the liquid crystal display screen (2) disposed inside the case (1) whereas claim 1 recite a display screen exposed externally of the case. Hibino does not mention the position of the display screen. Hattori teaches a well-known a liquid crystal display screen (15) exposed externally of the case (13). Therefore, it would

Art Unit: 2675

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to have used the expose display panel of Hattori to the display panel of Ueda as modified by Hibino so as to allow a number of people to view the image simultaneously as well as to avoid a number of drawbacks for the small eyepiece type viewfinder such as missing the subject because the operator is unaware of his or her surrounding or the camera could not be physically moved fast enough to catch up with a fast moving object or the like.

As to claim 4, this claim differs from claim 1 only in that claim 4 is method claim whereas claim 1 is apparatus. This method claim 4 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to apparatus claim 1 above.

As to claim 5, Hibino clearly teaches gamma correction ( $\gamma$  correction); see column 6, lines 56-61.

As to claim 6, Hibino clearly teaches luminance correction; see column 4, lines 10-15.

As to claim 7, Hibino clearly teaches contour correction; see column 4, lines 10-15.

As to claims 10-12, these claims recites the same limitation as claims 5-7. Thus, they are analyzed with respect to claims 5-7 above.

3. Claims 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueda in view of Hibino and Hattori as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Etoh (U.S. Patent No. 5,729,289).

Art Unit: 2675

As to claim 3, note the discussion of Ueda, Hibino and Hattori above, Ueda teaches an output circuit, but does not mention it can removably attaches to the liquid crystal display device. Etoh teaches the circuitry disposed on the case (1A) can removably attaches to the liquid crystal display (1B); see column 3, lines 32-37. . Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to have used removable image pick-device having output circuit from the display panel to the video camera of Ueda as modified by Hibino and Hattori so that device can be arranged in the carry bag easily.

4. Claims 8-9 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueda in view of Hibino and Hattori as applied to claims 1 and 4 above, and further in view of Kawada et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,179,437) or Konishi et al (5,461,429).

As to claims 8-9 and 13-14, note the discussion of Ueda, Hibino and Hattori above, Ueda teaches white balance correction, and Hibino further teaches luminance correction, contour correction, gamma correction, but does not mention hue and saturation corrections. In same field of endeavor, Kawada teaches hue correction as well as saturation correction is automatically conducted ; see column 1, lines 16-18. Similar to the Kawada, Konishi teaches color hue and color saturation can be controlled besides making the accurate white balance correction; see column 6, lines 12-17. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to have used the hue and color saturation correction circuit as taught by Kawada or

Art Unit: 2675

Konishi to the color correction of Ueda so as to provide high saturation level and hue level to the displayed color image, thereby the image can be viewed with proper colors.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 3-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

In view of amendment and the argument presented by applicant, the references of Hibino, Kawada and Konishi have been added for new ground of rejection.

**Inquiries**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-6603.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner supervisor, Steven Saras can be reached at 305-9720.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

**(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)**

Art Unit: 2675

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121

Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist)

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.



C. Nguyen  
January 11, 2002



CHANH NGUYEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER